

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

LEOURIETA B. GLASS,)	8:11CV211
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	MEMORANDUM
)	AND ORDER
STATE OF NEBRASKA, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

This matter is before the court on 14 Motions filed by Plaintiff Leourieta B. Glass (“Glass” or “Plaintiff”). As set forth below, Plaintiff’s Motions are denied.

MOTIONS TO STRIKE

Plaintiff has filed numerous Motions to Strike in response to Defendants’ Motions to Dismiss. (Filing Nos. [65](#), [67](#), [70](#), [96](#), [102](#), [104](#), [110](#), [112](#), [145](#), and [148](#).) Defendants’ Motions to Dismiss are properly filed Rule 12(b) motions. As such, the court will not strike them, and Plaintiff’s Motions to Strike will be denied. Furthermore, Plaintiff’s Motions to Strike are duplicative, frivolous, nonsensical, or all three. **Plaintiff is cautioned against filing frivolous motions.** Failure to comply with this Memorandum and Order will result in further action by this court, including sanctions if necessary.

MOTIONS TO SET ASIDE JUDGMENT AND FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

Plaintiff has filed a Motion to Set Aside Judgment and a “Motion and Affidavit to Convene a Three-Judge Court and Injunction [sic] Relief.” (Filing Nos. [90](#) and [92](#).) These motions are duplicative of arguments that have already been raised by Plaintiff and denied by the court. (See Filing Nos. [57](#) and [78](#).) As such, these motions will be denied.

MOTION TO INQUIRE INTO TRUTHFULNESS OF PLEADINGS

Plaintiff has filed a “Motion for the Court to Inquire into the Truthfulness [sic] of Pleading Filed With This [sic] by Attorney Richard Gilloon for the Benefit of Defendant Oris J. Glass, Jr.” (Filing No. [136](#).) Plaintiff’s Motion is nonsensical. Further, she has not provided any evidence or law to support her Motion. As such, it will be denied.

MOTION FOR RECUSAL

Plaintiff has filed a Motion for Recusal of the undersigned judge. (Filing No. [144](#).) In her Motion, Plaintiff alleges the undersigned judge deliberately violated her “liberties” in the past in Case Number 8:06cv699.¹ The court has carefully reviewed Plaintiff’s Motion and the filings in Case Number 8:06cv699. In accordance with [28 U.S.C. § 455\(a\)](#), the court finds that there is nothing indicating that the court’s “impartiality might reasonably be questioned” or that there is any other basis for recusal or reassignment in this matter. Accordingly, Plaintiff’s Motion for Recusal (filing no. [144](#)) will be denied.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

1. Plaintiff’s Motions to Strike (filing nos. [65](#), [67](#), [70](#), [96](#), [102](#), [104](#), [110](#), [112](#), [145](#), and [148](#)) are denied.

¹The court takes judicial notice that in *Campos v. Barney G. Inc., et al.*, 8:06CV699 (D. Neb. 2006), the court entered default judgment against three defendants, including Glass. (Case No. 8:06CV699, Filing No. [15](#).) The court later vacated the judgment entered against the defendants in light of an out-of court settlement reached by the parties. (Case No. 8:06CV699, Filing No. [17](#).)

2. Plaintiff's Motion to Set Aside Judgment and "Motion and Affidavit to Convene a Three-Judge Court and Injunction Relief" (filing nos. [90](#) and [92](#)) are denied.

3. Plaintiff's "Motion for the Court to Inquire into the Truthfulness [sic] of Pleading Filed With This by Attorney Richard Gilloon for the Benefit of Defendant Oris J. Glass, Jr" (filing no. [136](#)) is denied.

4. Plaintiff's Motion for Recusal (filing no. [144](#)) is denied.

5. Plaintiff is cautioned against filing frivolous motions. Failure to comply with this Memorandum and Order will result in further action by this court, including sanctions if necessary.

DATED this 13th day of October, 2011.

BY THE COURT:

s/ Joseph F. Bataillon
Chief United States District Judge

*This opinion may contain hyperlinks to other documents or Web sites. The U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska does not endorse, recommend, approve, or guarantee any third parties or the services or products they provide on their Web sites. Likewise, the court has no agreements with any of these third parties or their Web sites. The court accepts no responsibility for the availability or functionality of any hyperlink. Thus, the fact that a hyperlink ceases to work or directs the user to some other site does not affect the opinion of the court.